

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 474

PS 016 258

AUTHOR Weil, Jane
TITLE One Third More: Maine Head Start Expansion with State Funds.
INSTITUTION Action Opportunities, Inc., Ellsworth, ME.
SPONS AGENCY Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (DHHS), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 86
GRANT ACYF-01-CH-000229
NOTE 54p.
AVAILABLE FROM Fel-State Partnership Project, Action Opportunities, Inc., P.O. Box 562, Ellsworth, ME 04605 (\$3.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Background; *Compensatory Education; *Early Childhood Education; *Educational Finance; *Educational Legislation; *Program Administration; *Program Development; State Programs
*Maine; Program Replication; *Project Head Start; Research Results
IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT

The expansion of Project Head Start in Maine to the point of serving nearly 25 percent of eligible children is detailed in this report. Section I describes the expansion and some of its benefits, such as equalization of services across county boundaries and the establishment of a uniform unit cost-per-child for use in appropriating state funds. Section II reports on preschool legislative and funding actions as of 1985 in several other states. A brief summary of the research supporting increased comprehensive, high quality, early childhood programs for disadvantaged children is provided in section III. In section IV, many direct service and administrative issues faced by the states as they seek to meet the increasingly complex needs of young children and their families are addressed, including Head Start as a model, how early childhood programs should be delivered, day care, salaries and credentials, services to handicapped children, and interagency coordination. Five appendices provide background information about Maine's Head Start appropriation. Appendix 2, Fiscal Year 1985 Head Start Program Final Enrollment Allocation in the State of Maine, is thought to be particularly useful for other states attempting similar actions.
(RM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED278474

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
 Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

One THIRD More

Maine bond shift expansion
with state funds

by Jane Weil

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jane Weil

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

DS 016258

**Cover illustration by Rob Shetterley, Surry, Maine
Printing by Fundy Bay Printing, Cutler, Maine**

ONE THIRD MORE:

Maine Head Start Expansion

With State Funds

Jane Weil, M.Ed.
Federal-State Partnership Project
Action Opportunities, Inc.
Ellsworth, Maine

Fall, 1986

DEDICATION

This report is dedicated to the memories of Margaret Bruns and Dorothy Gross. Both were Maine early childhood professionals who, while entirely committed to providing quality services to children and loving support for the adults with whom they worked, applied their intelligence and insight to the larger questions of public policy as well. The steps taken by a state on behalf of young children are far-reaching. May every state, as it considers its policy directions for young children and their families, benefit from the wise counsel of such individuals as Margaret and Dorothy.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	
Preface	
Introduction by David P. Weickart, Ph.D.	
I. Maine's Appropriation of Head Start Funds	1
A. Introduction	1
• Equalization	2
• Equitable Services	2
• Standard Unit Cost	3
• Contact Hours	3
• Income Eligibility	3
• Services to Handicapped	4
• Regulations and Guidelines	4
• Matching Funds	4
• Application Process and Central Administration	5
• Time Pressures	5
• Varied Impact	6
• The 1986-87 Year	6
B. How Did It Happen?	7
• State Report on Educational Status	7
• Legislative Action	8
II. A Growing National Move	10
III. The Case for Early Services	19
IV. Emergent Issues	26
• Questions Frequently Raised	26
• Head Start as a Model	26
• How Should Early Childhood Programs be Delivered?	28
• Child Care	29
• Salaries and Credentials	30
• Services to Handicapped Children	31
• Interagency Coordination	31
V. Summary	33
References	34
Appendices	37

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank a number of people for their kind assistance with this report. Janet Peters, assistant director of the Maine Division of Community Services, explained the legislative process which led to the allocation of state funds for Head Start expansion. The Maine Head Start directors gave generously of their time to meet with me for individual interviews. Those directors were Lisa Ayotte, Belinda Carter, Ken Cole, Mark Conrad, Jan Covell, Debbie Damon, Pat Finn, Grant Lee, Christine Maxcy, Harriet Morrow, Susan Motta, Gail Oulette and Ann Ward.

Helen Blank at the Children's Defense Fund provided me with relevant legislation from several states. Carolyn Morado discussed with me her 1985 paper, "Prekindergarten Programs for Four-Year-Olds: State Education Initiatives". Dr. Lawrence Schweinhart of the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation responded to the content of the report and also provided valuable assistance by suggesting people to contact in several states.

Individuals in many states helped by responding to a questionnaire. I am especially grateful to Jeanne Darneille at the Department of Community Development in the state of Washington; Alexandra Larson of the Governor's Committee on Children's Services Planning in New Jersey; Judy Doebler, Carole Thomson, Alicia Castro and Carolyn Logan with the Departments of Education in Oklahoma, Massachusetts, Texas and Michigan; Linda Dickenson at C.H.I.L.D., Inc. in Rhode Island; Ellen Hoffenberg with the Governor's Constituency for Children in Florida; Mary Culkin at the National Conference of State Legislatures; Brian McNulty, Director of Special Services in the Colorado Department of Education and Grey Ritchie, Kindergarten Supervisor in the Virginia Department of Education.

My thanks to Darlene Henderson for her patience, helpful suggestions and excellent secretarial assistance through several versions of this report and to Catherine Bell for editing.

I particularly thank Grant Lee, Executive Director of Action Opportunities, Inc. in Ellsworth, Maine. His enthusiasm about what Maine's Head Start expansion has meant for the agency he directs, his belief in this report, and his understanding of what is possible as other states consider increased early childhood services were most valuable.

Without assistance from so many individuals this report would not have been possible; however, the responsibility for the report remains that of the author.

PREFACE

During the past few years the pace has quickened regarding states' interest in early childhood services. One response in Maine has been to expand the capacity of Head Start by appropriating state funds to those agencies administering the federally-funded Head Start program. One-third more children are being served as a result.

Section I describes this expansion and some of its benefits, such as geographic equalization of services and a standard unit cost.

Section II reports on preschool legislative and funding actions in several other states. It draws on 1985 data compiled by Carolyn Morado and by Lawrence Schweinhart and David Weikart. Phone conversations with individuals in many states provided information about recent early childhood advances.

A brief summary of the research supporting increased comprehensive, high quality, early childhood programs for disadvantaged children is provided in Section III.

In Section IV many direct service and administrative issues faced by the states as they seek to meet the increasingly complex needs of young children and their families are addressed.

There are five Appendices which provide background information about Maine's Head Start appropriation. Appendix 2 may be particularly useful to those in other states who might be considering similar action.



INTRODUCTION

The need for early childhood education has gradually become accepted throughout the country. Currently 62 percent of women with children under 18 are working. Fifty-four percent of women with children under six, and 48 percent with children under one are in the work force. The need for early childhood education and care has become a major fact in our society. Fortunately, the research evidence such as that cited in this report of Maine's expansion of Head Start, indicates that high quality programs can substantially contribute to the development of children. Interestingly, it's a fact that economic studies of such programs indicate that they pay off for society as well. Thus, high quality early childhood education and care wins for the child, the family, and for society at large.

The State of Maine is unique in its effort to use the Head Start network within the state as a vehicle for expanding services to disadvantaged children. In doing so, it has innovated a way of expanding services and has demonstrated a capacity to accept responsibility for young children who need such services. While nationally 18 percent of children who qualify for Head Start are served, Maine has now approached the 25 percent level. While neither figure is acceptable in the long run, the positive experience and results that Maine has had in designing ways to increase service indicates its feasibility. Impressive in the report is the responsible, almost casual, way in which the state accepted this obligation toward its disadvantaged youngsters. The state increased financial support to individual Head Start agencies to increase the number of children served. Special, too, is the fact that the state adopted Head Start regulations so that programs could operate without a mixture of rules and paperwork that would essentially hamstring the operation.

However, high quality early education programs face problems that are deep and not easily resolved. Staff recruiting and retention are serious issues related mostly to inadequate pay. Designing programs to reach isolated rural youngsters and maintaining standards once programs are in place, are examples of complicated operational problems that will require

continued effort. The State of Maine is to be congratulated for taking on the issue of expansion of services and for finding an efficient and economical way to deliver on such a goal. As it is unlikely that Washington will continue to do more than give small yearly increases to National Head Start, the state will need to continue to assume the burden of expansion of services to those who need them. The economic studies done so far on high quality early education programs indicate that it is actually an economic benefit to the state to undertake such activities for disadvantaged children. When this finding is combined with the need to educate all youngsters to assume an effective role in the work force, early education programs are a blend of social good that serves all.

It is clear that Maine has shown leadership in this area and it is to be hoped that this leadership will be extended.

David P. Weickart, President
High/Scope Educational Research Foundation
August, 1986



I. MAINE'S APPROPRIATION OF HEAD START FUNDS

A. INTRODUCTION

In a September, 1984 special session, the Maine Legislature appropriated \$1.7 million in state dollars for expansion of Head Start services. The state Head Start funds are administered by the Division of Community Services (DCS).

The legislative intent was to serve more children in all counties, to get the new money distributed quickly, and to equalize the percentage of eligible Head Start children being served throughout the state.

By January, 1985, the DCS had allocated \$1,662,500 to the 13 federally supported Head Start grantee agencies. This amounted to 38 percent of Maine's fiscal year 1984 federal Head Start allocation. For four months, September through December, 1984, the grantee agencies worked to open new centers or add children at existing centers. By January, 1985, an additional 665 Maine children were being served and 35 new classrooms had been opened.¹ (See Appendix 1.) Figure 1 gives the total of federal and Maine appropriations for 1985.

FIGURE 1

	Federal	Maine	Total
Dollars	\$4,058,313	\$1,662,500	\$5,720,813
Children	1,669	665	2,334

No new Head Start grantee agencies were formed. Maine, through the DCS, worked with the 13 existing grantee agencies. Most of these had been in place since Maine first began providing Head Start services in the mid-1960's.

Equalization

Nationally, Head Start funds are distributed to the states based on a formula to provide equity. An important element of the legislative intent in Maine was further equalization of Head Start services within the state. Prior to state involvement, there had been little consistency or rationale from one grantee agency to another about the percentage of eligible children being served or the level of funding per child. Appendix 2 is the chart developed by the DCS indicating how the new state funds were divided.

Maine has 16 counties. In a county-by-county analysis done by the DCS, 9.4 percent of the eligible children in one county were being served, while in another the figure was 50.7 percent. The Head Start national average was 20 percent. The cost-per-child figures ranged from a low of \$1,980 to a high of \$2,873 - a variance of almost \$900.

Using a cost-per-child figure of \$2,500, the DCS first determined it would bring all counties up to the national 20 percent level and 190 new placements were established. An additional 475 placements were then allocated based on a county's percentage of the state's low income children. When all the calculations had been made, approximately 25 percent of Maine's eligible Head Start children were being served.

Equitable Services

Federal Head Start appropriations in Maine are based, at least in part, on history. This seems to be true in other states as well. The amounts received by Head Start agencies in the late 1960's or 1970's provided a baseline. It was difficult for grantee agencies to get the funds needed for expansion because it would have required significant reductions to other grantee agencies. One Maine Head Start director, when asked why her agency had been able to serve more than 20 percent of the eligible children for many years, responded, "I guess someone in the early days of the agency wrote a good grant and it established a funding level that has allowed us to serve that many kids."²

Another director reported that, despite repeated attempts over more than a dozen years to get additional federal Head Start resources for a very

under-served county, it was impossible to move beyond the original level of funding. There had, of course, been various cost-of-living increases over the years, but these were not enough to open new centers or serve more children.

This element of fairness made possible by the state's appropriation and the DCS allocation method has been hailed by the Maine Head Start directors. "The state has treated us all the same and that has been great!"³

Standard Unit Cost

The DCS collected cost-per-child figures from the 13 Head Start grantee agencies after the expansion legislation was passed. As previously mentioned, these costs ranged from \$1,980 per child to \$2,873 per child.⁴ The DCS established \$2,500 per child as the figure it would use in appropriating the state funds in the first year.

Contact Hours

As well as equalizing the state Head Start funds across Maine, the DCS looked at the amount of service received by children. Because of the many options available to Head Start grantees under federal regulations, the number of hours in the classroom varied widely. Some children were in a center five half-days a week. Others attended two, three or four times a week. Still others were served through a home-based option and saw a home teacher one-to-two hours a week.

The DCS had concerns about the limited amount of service being provided to some children. As a result, it required that children attending centers funded by the state must receive 510 hours of service per year. Those seen at home must receive 100 hours of socialization with peers per year.

Income Eligibility

The DCS defines low income, for purposes of Head Start, at 125 percent of the poverty level. This, coupled with the federal ruling permitting 10 percent of the Head Start population to be over-income, allows for some marginally higher income children to be served.

Head Start directors report satisfaction with this regulation because it allows agencies to serve some children of the "working poor," who may be only slightly above the federal income level. As one director said, "The state funds allow us the flexibility to take a child whose parents may be one or two hundred dollars over income. We know the child needs Head Start and now we can be a bit more open to those kids."⁵

Services to Handicapped

The federal requirement that 10 percent of children served by Head Start must be handicapped was not included in the initial state guidelines.

A standard unit cost and a required number of contact hours were the two major guidelines imposed on grantee agencies receiving state funds. Because the DCS was asking its grantees to get new centers opened and new children enrolled and provided with 17 weeks of service as of January, 1985, it decided not to include the handicapped requirement that year. Several grantees did meet the 10 percent guideline on their own initiative.

In the fall of 1986, the DCS did make the 10 percent handicapped federal regulation a part of their requirements.

Regulations and Guidelines

With the exception of the requirement that 10 percent of the Head Start children must be handicapped, the DCS adopted the federal Head Start guidelines with very few alterations or additions. Again, the directors have appreciated this consistency. "We aren't working with apples and oranges. What goes for the federally-funded kids, goes for the state-funded kids. That's good and that's the way it should be."⁶

Matching Funds

The DCS established a 20 percent match requirement for the state funds, just as the federal government has for its Head Start funds. This ensured that state funds were used to serve additional children, which had been the legislative intent, rather than to help grantees meet their federal match requirements.

Application Process and Central Administration

In Maine, Head Start is delivered through ten Community Action Program (CAP) agencies and three single-purpose agencies. (See Appendix 3.) The DCS receives copies of their federal Head Start applications because it is the unit within the state's executive branch which oversees the receipt of federal Head Start funds.

Since it already receives and reviews copies of the 13 federal Head Start applications, the DCS simplified its own application process. The paperwork necessary for receiving state Head Start funds is considerably less than that required for federal funds. Head Start directors voiced unanimous appreciation that administrative paperwork in relation to the new money has been kept to a minimum. "The state's annual application procedures and quarterly report formats have been easy to work with. We send them our federal Head Start application so they have a lot of detail to look at if they want to."⁷

For 18 months, from September, 1984, when the state funds were appropriated, until April, 1986, the DCS administered the Head Start funds with no additional personnel in its central office. At that time a Head Start program specialist was hired. Thus far the state agency's administrative overhead has been minimal.

Time Pressures

There were time constraints in the 1984-85 year. The DCS expected the Head Start programs to begin serving the additional state-funded children by January, 1985, thereby providing them with at least 17 weeks of services. Most Head Start programs in Maine operate from late September or early October to sometime in May. The legislation was not passed until September.

Between October, 1984 and January, 1985, most Head Start agencies were extremely busy locating new classroom sites in communities where the need existed. In most cases, this required negotiations about rent and utilities with site owners who were often churches, municipalities or other nonprofit organizations. Hard on the heels of these negotiations came clean-up, fix-up or major renovations of the new sites.

New staff needed to be interviewed, hired and trained. Agencies recruited children from existing waiting lists, through local papers, Head Start staff, parents and word of mouth.

The Education Coordinator in one of the Head Start agencies experiencing almost a doubling of its capacity said, "It is great to be serving so many more children who need Head Start. But the 1984-85 year was a hard one for the agency. We had to do so much to get new centers open by January. And we had so little lead time! We are still feeling the effects." These sentiments were expressed by every Head Start director.⁸

Varied Impact

Some grantee agencies benefited much more than others due to the state action. The grantee which benefited least gained 10 new children and \$25,000 in new state dollars. This was the only agency to initiate a home-based program with the state funds, thereby serving 10 very rural, isolated children.

The grantee gaining the most got 120 new children and \$300,000. For those agencies which gained substantially, the state action allowed the opening of centers in numerous rural locations where there was documented need but no available resources. For some grantees, the state resources were not enough to open new centers, so children were added in existing classrooms. The impact was less dramatic in these cases. One director reported that the new funds were not really enough to bother about. Nevertheless, all the Head Start directors have indicated an enthusiasm about the funding and what it has allowed them to do - mainly serve additional children.⁹

The 1986-87 Year

For its second full program year (beginning in September, 1986), the DCS requested two million dollars for Head Start in its budget to the governor and legislature. The request was approved and \$1.9 million was allocated to the 13 grantee agencies, creating 59 additional placements for children. The DCS also raised the state's per child allocation by \$125 from \$2,500 to \$2,625.

Word of this additional increase came in late February, 1986, as Head

Start administrators were absorbing the news of a 1.4 percent federal cut due to Gramm-Rudman. This slight additional state increase helped ease the pain of federal cutbacks. Figure 2 indicates the amount of state money available since January, 1985.

FIGURE 2

Jan., 1985-May, 1985	Sept., 1985-May, 1986	Sept., 1986-May, 1987
\$1.7 million	\$1.7 million	\$1.9 million

B. HOW DID IT HAPPEN?

The state expansion of Head Start in Maine is the happy result of a recommendation being adopted and implemented very soon after it was made.

State Report on Educational Status

Following the release of A Nation at Risk by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, Maine's Governor, Joseph E. Brennan, created a similar group to study and make recommendations about educational needs in the state. The Commission on the Status of Education in Maine was established in July, 1983. In June, 1984, it issued its report, Education: Maine's Most Important Investment, containing 22 recommendations.¹⁰ The report's fifth recommendation (see Appendix 4) stated:

"We recommend that the Department of Educational and Cultural Services (DECS) and local school systems place a high priority on better preparing children during their earliest years of schooling.

In particular, we recommend that:

- the DECS develop a standard screening and assessment program that will allow schools to place pupils in grades K-3 according to their readiness;

- the Early Childhood Education Plans program be expanded, at an annual cost of \$250,000, to accommodate the interest already expressed by school officials in developing K-3 readiness programs; and
- the federally-funded Head Start program be expanded, with State appropriations at an annual cost of \$2.1 million, to serve at least 20 percent of Maine's eligible children.

The report's footnote stated, "In 1982, Head Start programs were available to an average of 12-15 percent of the eligible students across Maine, compared to a 20 percent average nationwide. In Washington and Hancock counties, Head Start is available to only 7 percent of those eligible."

Among the report's 22 recommendations were some which generated considerable discussion and controversy across the state. One was to establish a \$15,000 annual base salary for certified teachers. Another, to increase Maine's minimum high school graduation requirements, caught the attention of the public. These two recommendations, along with several others, had significant cost implications for the state.

One result of the attention paid to the more controversial recommendations in the report was a relative lack of attention to the Head Start expansion recommendation.

Legislative Action

A major piece of legislation was developed based on the recommendations in this report on educational reforms. The Maine Legislature was called to a special session by the governor in September of 1984 to deal specifically with the proposed legislation. One of the hearings on the bill was on the Head Start recommendation. The appropriation of \$1.7 million for Head Start passed with little controversy or fanfare. The Head Start community did not mobilize extensively to lobby for this expansion, although some Head Start directors and parents did testify. There were no opponents to this part of the legislation. Most early childhood supporters and some Head Start agency directors had little knowledge that state expansion was on the horizon.

No specific Maine law has been written regarding state funding for Head Start. There is no separate Maine statute regarding this appropriation. There is now simply a Head Start line item in the budget of the Maine DCS. The legal mandate of the DCS has since been expanded to include its administration of state Head Start funds (see Appendix 5), but no separate legislation about state-funded Head Start was ever introduced.

Why are the funds assigned to this unit of state government rather than the Maine Department of Educational and Cultural Services? Historically in Maine, most of the Head Start programs are administered by CAP agencies. None are administered by public schools as is the case in some other states. The DCS oversees state and federal funds such as fuel assistance, winterization, and surplus food which are managed by the CAPs. It seemed reasonable, therefore, that it handle the state Head Start funds. The DCS had also done the research on the Head Start recommendation for the Commission on the Status of Education in Maine.

Not surprisingly, the legislative story has a human element as well. The vice-chair of the Commission was the majority leader of the Maine House of Representatives at the time. She was a believer in early childhood services, had advocated for the early childhood recommendations to be included in the Commission's report, and had worked hard for the Head Start funding when it was considered during the legislative special session. "Many of us on the Commission wanted more parent involvement in the schools. Head Start is so open to parents. We need more of that. We need it in the regular schools and we need more Head Start classrooms so more children and families get off to a good beginning."!!



II. A GROWING NATIONAL MOVE

Although Maine appears to be unique in having appropriated state funds specifically to serve more children in Head Start, it is not alone in a growing move by states to support early childhood services.

Since 1977, Alaska has appropriated state money to meet a portion of the federal Head Start match requirement. This has grown from a \$600,000 appropriation in 1980 to \$2,712,500 in 1986.¹²

In most states where early childhood funding has been approved, the administration of the funds has been delegated to the state education agency. In this, California leads the nation. During World War II California opened day care centers for the thousands of female munitions plant workers. Instead of closing these centers when the war ended, as other states did, California has built an extensive and varied network of early childhood services from this original base. The Child Development Division in its Department of Education provides most of the administration.

As the state with probably the most diverse range of state-supported early childhood services, California has both federal and state programs targeted at low income children. The State Preschool Program, which is similar to Head Start, is administered by the California State Department of Education with a 1986 budget of \$36 million.¹³

In Colorado, a bill to appropriate state general revenue funds for three and four year old bilingual and handicapped children was considered but not passed in both 1985 and 1986. The legislation would have reimbursed school districts serving these children in the same manner currently used in relation to older public school students. The three and four year olds would have been served in half-day programs, thereby generating half the reimbursement. The Department of Education estimated that there were 2,600 bilingual and 4,200 handicapped young children in need of services. Support for the measure grew from 1985 to 1986 and it is likely the bill will be submitted again in January, 1987.¹⁴

In April, 1985, a report entitled "Four Year Olds: Who Is Responsible?" was submitted to the Connecticut Board of Education.¹⁵

In the District of Columbia, support for prekindergarten programs has grown from \$1.9 million to \$3.1 million from fiscal year 1985 to 1986. Programs are expected to operate in virtually all of the capitol's elementary schools.¹⁶

For more than five years Florida has appropriated state funds (\$2.2 million for fiscal year 1986) enabling more children to be served by the federally-funded migrant program.¹⁷ In the summer of 1986, the Florida legislature passed the Pre-Kindergarten Early Intervention Act setting the stage for future early childhood initiatives. A state advisory council was established which brings together the Department of Education, the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, as well as representatives from a coalition of early childhood advocates. An initial appropriation of \$750,000 was authorized. These funds will be administered by the Department of Education but with advice from the state council. In the first year these funds will go to identified exemplary Head Start, Title XX day care and public school programs to increase or improve existing services. It is anticipated that increased appropriations will be sought in coming years.¹⁸

Educational reform legislation passed in Illinois in 1985. It made a total of \$12.1 million available for 3-5 year olds at risk for academic failure. Grants were awarded to school districts on a competitive basis with \$3.1 million for screening and \$9 million for educational services. Because the money did not become available until June of 1985 and time was needed to complete the competitive grant process, school districts did not receive funds until the second semester of the 1985-86 school year. One hundred projects, serving 234 school districts, were funded. The money is administered by the state Board of Education but school districts have the option of contracting with others for the screening or educational services. Approximately one-third of the projects chose to contract with special education districts, universities, Head Start or day care.

During 1986 the Illinois Board of Education proposed \$58 million for this program in their 1986-87 budget. This was reduced to \$24 million by the legislature and to \$12.6 million by the governor. This amount is seen as a reduction from the 1985 \$12.1 million since the \$12.1 was actually

provided to school districts for only the second half of the 1985-86 school year.¹⁹

In July, 1986, legislation was passed in Kentucky to create an Office of Child Development within the governor's office. Funds were appropriated to establish the office and an interagency council which would work on a large number of tasks.²⁰

About \$2.4 million has been appropriated in Louisiana preferably for full-day programs for four year olds, although part-day programs will be allowed. These funds are aimed at children at risk of school failure.²¹

In Maryland, state funding for four year olds has increased over the past half-decade. For fiscal year 1986, \$2.25 million was appropriated for 2,300 four year olds. School districts are eligible to operate programs based on reading scores of third graders.²² In Montgomery County, funds from the county budget are used to meet the federal match requirement and expand services to more children. The preliminary 1987 county budget had \$3 million allocated to Head Start.²³

Early childhood grants were established in Massachusetts through the 1985 passage of the Public School Improvement Act. This legislation is interesting in that it allows for four options: prekindergarten for three and four year olds, day care, enhanced kindergarten and transitional first grades. There are provisions allowing for the combining of day care and early childhood education. The state's fiscal year 1987 budget, passed in the summer of 1986, made \$8.5 million available to the state Department of Education. The legislation creates a statewide early childhood advisory council which will work on program standards, teacher certification and a study on future trends. Local early childhood advisory councils must be developed to apply for the state funds. The legislation also calls for the creation of an Office of Early Childhood within the Department.²⁴

At the same time, a \$2.8 million appropriation was passed by the Massachusetts legislature for grants to Head Start programs. Through a 1985 governor's initiative the salaries for day care personnel had been raised fairly significantly, leaving Head Start salaries very low in comparison. There had been a 33 percent turnover of Head Start staff during the two previous years and a 50 percent turnover of Head Start directors.

There are approximately 8,500 Massachusetts children served by Head Start. These new Head Start funds, also administered by the Department of Education, are allocated at about \$300 per child. They are being used primarily to improve salaries rather than to provide Head Start services to more children. The state appropriation is about 12.5 percent of the Massachusetts federal Head Start funding level.²⁵

The Michigan legislature appropriated \$1.1 million for a pilot program in 1985. Some projects are collaborative between schools and child care agencies. Half are for children with a potential for learning problems.²⁶ A small portion of these funds (\$100,000) allowed for planning and monitoring within the Department of Education.²⁷ In 1986, legislation which would have moved beyond the pilot phase was narrowly defeated. However, the original \$1.1 million appropriation will continue and it is likely that the more comprehensive 1986 legislation will be introduced again.²⁸

Minnesota began funding the Early Childhood Family Education program on a pilot basis in 29 school districts in 1982. The current budget is \$11.3 million and any school district operating Community Education is eligible. It is estimated that 80 percent of the state's districts participate. This program does not provide direct services to children but is aimed at enhancing the abilities of parents of children from birth to school entry age.²⁹

Similarly, Missouri began an experimental program called Parents As First Teachers in 1981 with financial assistance from a private foundation. The purpose is to help parents be effective early educators during their child's first three years of life. As of the fall of 1985, the program was available through 530 of Missouri's 537 school districts to about 10 percent of Missouri's parents of young children.³⁰

New Jersey has supported school-based programs for four year olds for at least a decade. Over 5,700 four year olds are now enrolled and school districts are reimbursed by the state based on a per pupil count.³¹ In 1985 the Governor's Committee on Children's Services Planning released its Action Plan for Children. This report recommends a comprehensive early childhood development program to be phased in over a five year period. It proposes that this be very similar to Head Start with 80 percent of the funds provided by the state and 20 percent by the sponsoring

agency. Proposed costs to the state for the first year are \$12 million, based on a \$3,000 per year cost for 5,000 children.³²

New York is second to California in its current state expenditures for early childhood services. The State Department of Education has funded the New York Experimental Prekindergarten Program since 1966. Funding has grown from \$5 million to \$20 million, and 7,000 to 8,000 disadvantaged three and four year olds are served in Head Start-like programs.³³ In the spring of 1986 the Early Childhood Education Commission appointed by New York City Mayor Edward Koch released its report, Take A Giant Step, recommending increased early childhood services in New York City over the next four years. The Commission found that currently almost half the city's four year olds are served by Head Start, child care programs, school district programs or private preschools. It recommended phasing in 10,000 four year olds per year over the next five years, utilizing the existing network of Head Start, child care and public schools. It proposed a cost of \$2,750 per child.³⁴ Due to budget restraints, however, only 3,000 additional children will be served in the 1986-87 school year. Programs for half the children will be managed by the city's Board of Education. The other half will be operated by the Agency for Child Development which administers Head Start and many day care programs in New York City.³⁵

Ohio, as a result of a June, 1984 report from the Ohio Commission on Education, appropriated \$250,000 for nine prekindergarten programs for four year olds and for information and referral services for families of preschool children.³⁶

In Oklahoma, programs for four year olds have grown from 10 in 1980 to 34 in 1986. School districts apply and grants of \$30,000 are awarded with geographic balance across the state as a factor. The grants are designed to serve a maximum of 40 children divided into two half-day sessions. Districts supplement their grants with local funds.³⁷ As there are 613 school districts in Oklahoma, this program represents only a beginning. Yet, despite a 10 percent cut in funds during 1986, it is anticipated these 34 programs will continue in the 1986-87 school year.³⁸

Four year olds in Pennsylvania may be served through programs administered by interested school districts. Pennsylvania is one of the few states which has made such service available for over 10 years. School

districts must fund the first year of a program but are then reimbursed by the state on a per pupil basis.³⁹

In June, 1986, a bill appropriating \$345,000 for Head Start was signed into law in Rhode Island. This amount is approximately 10 percent of Rhode Island's federal Head Start allocation and will be used to assist the state's eight grantee agencies in meeting Head Start's requirement for local matching funds. The funds will be administered by the Department of Human Services.⁴⁰

In 1984 South Carolina passed the Education Improvement Act which appropriated more than \$5 million for early childhood programs for children at risk of school failure. The state plan calls for yearly increases until 1989 when the appropriation will reach more than \$16 million and give all "at risk" children the opportunity to be served.⁴¹

The Education Opportunity Act passed in 1985 in Texas targeted \$36 million for prekindergarten programs in any school district where 15 or more eligible children are identified. Eligible children are four year olds who are unable to speak or comprehend English or whose family incomes are at or below subsistence level.⁴² Schools can apply for as much as a three year waiver if they lack space and some have done so. Because of recent revenue reductions in Texas, it is possible that there will be reductions in this appropriation. However, during the 1985-86 school year, nearly 36,000 children were served by 1,100 school districts.⁴³

Soon after the 1986 elections in Virginia, a Commission on Excellence in Education was appointed by the governor. Included on the Commission are several current and former members of the state's General Assembly, as well as representatives of the Board of Education. Among many other educational issues, this commission is considering a recommendation to increase the role of public schools in serving four year olds.⁴⁴

Whether or not state funds are being considered or appropriated specifically for Head Start expansion, Head Start is often used as the model. Since 1970, Washington, like Alaska, has appropriated state money to meet a portion of the federal Head Start match requirement. In March, 1986, the Washington state legislature went much further, approving \$2.9 million to serve 1,000 additional children in a "Head Start-like" program. The funds are to be allocated through a competitive process with certain un-

served and underserved geographic areas having priority. The Head Start community helped shape the legislation and Head Start agencies are eligible applicants along with schools, nonprofit and profit organizations. The Washington funds are administered by the Department of Community Development which is comparable to the DCS in Maine.⁴⁵

The state-by-state picture is obviously complex. Some states are moving toward implementing comprehensive Head Start-like programs which include parent involvement, education, social services, health and nutrition components. Others are more educationally oriented, and still others are designed to provide increased child care services.

Maine's appropriation of \$1.7 million for Head Start expansion was 38.4 percent of its federal Head Start allocation for 1985. The following chart indicates what the appropriations in other states would be if they appropriated funds at the same rate. The third column shows the number of additional children that could be served with those funds if states used the \$2,500 cost per child rate established in Maine during the first year.

Obviously, each state will make individual decisions about how and when to provide more Head Start or other early childhood services. The chart may provide long-range objectives for many states. (See Figure 3.)



FIGURE 3

POTENTIAL STATE-BY-STATE INCREASES BASED
ON MAINE'S STATE-APPROPRIATED FUNDING

<u>State</u>	<u>1985 Federal Head Start Allocation¹</u>	<u>If State Appropriated at Maine's Rate (38%)²</u>	<u>New Children Served at \$2,500 per child³</u>
Alabama	\$ 21,352,752	\$ 8,114,045	3,246
Alaska	2,227,571	846,476	339
Arizona	9,038,491	3,434,626	1,374
Arkansas	10,891,868	4,138,909	1,655
California	99,462,831	37,795,875	15,118
Colorado	9,615,046	3,653,717	1,461
Connecticut	9,829,720	3,735,293	1,494
Delaware	2,194,920	834,069	334
Dist. of Columbia	6,189,276	2,351,924	941
Florida	28,889,790	10,978,120	4,391
Georgia	24,783,192	9,417,612	3,767
Hawaii	3,927,596	1,492,486	597
Idaho	2,865,908	1,089,045	436
Illinois	52,856,287	20,085,389	8,034
Indiana	14,510,686	5,514,060	2,205
Iowa	7,652,059	2,907,782	1,163
Kansas	6,552,394	2,489,909	996
Kentucky	20,065,699	7,624,965	3,050
Louisiana	21,951,236	8,341,469	3,337
Maryland	13,901,705	5,282,647	2,113
Massachusetts	22,888,383	8,697,585	3,479
Michigan	13,336,000	16,372,680	6,549
Minnesota	10,810,149	4,107,856	1,643
Mississippi	51,873,929	19,712,093	7,885
Missouri	18,113,194	6,883,013	2,753

<u>State</u>	<u>1985 Federal Head Start Allocation¹</u>	<u>If State Appropriated at Maine's Rate (38%)²</u>	<u>New Children Served at \$2,500 per child³</u>
Montana	2,608,514	991,235	396
Nebraska	4,190,475	1,592,380	637
Nevada	1,480,431	562,563	225
New Hampshire	1,980,030	752,411	301
New Jersey	30,800,747	11,704,283	4,682
 New Mexico	 6,173,393	 2,345,889	 938
New York	77,026,711	29,270,150	11,708
North Carolina	21,875,075	8,312,528	3,325
North Dakota	1,522,244	578,452	231
Ohio	42,678,661	16,217,891	6,487
 Oklahoma	 12,522,259	 4,758,458	 1,903
Oregon	18,272,418	6,943,518	2,777
Pennsylvania	44,349,841	16,852,939	6,741
Rhode Island	3,388,537	1,287,644	515
South Carolina	13,669,244	5,194,312	2,078
 South Dakota	 2,401,976	 912,750	 365
Tennessee	18,508,481	7,033,222	2,813
Texas	47,110,935	17,902,155	7,161
Utah	4,315,448	1,639,870	656
Vermont	2,053,055	780,160	312
 Virginia	 14,793,641	 5,621,583	 2,249
Washington	11,487,141	4,365,113	1,746
West Virginia	8,903,968	3,383,507	1,353
Wisconsin	15,288,269	5,809,542	2,324
Wyoming	1,371,045	520,997	208

¹ 1985 Estimated State Head Start Allocations, Administration for Children, Youth, and Families.

² Maine's state-appropriated Head Start funds for 1985 were 38 percent of its Federal Head Start allocation of \$4,319,387.

³ Maine's DCS established \$2,500 per child as its allocation to grantees in 1985. In the fall of 1986, it began using a \$2,625 per child rate.

III. The Case for Early Services

Perry Preschool Project

For those interested in educational, economic or social welfare public policy development, the longitudinal research and thoughtful analysis undertaken by Dr. David Weikart and Dr. Lawrence Schweinhart and their colleagues in Ypsilanti, Michigan are most welcome. Their several monographs on the Perry Preschool Project present the most complete and thorough study of the effects of high quality early childhood education on disadvantaged children.

In 1962 the Ypsilanti school system began a preschool program designed as a research project with experimental and control groups. It was developed for disadvantaged children who, based on cognitive tests and economic background, seemed headed for failure. From 1962 to 1967 there were 123 children assigned randomly to an experimental or control group. Children in the experimental group participated in a half-day quality early childhood program from mid-October to late May (about 30 weeks) and received weekly home visits of 1 1/2 hours. Except for the first group of four year olds who began in 1962, all children in the experimental groups received two years of services, beginning at age three.

Those children selected for the study were the poorest in the Perry School neighborhood. They also had IQ scores ranging from 70 to 85 on the Stanford-Binet Scale. Using the educational terminology in common use during the early 1960's, these scores placed the children in the borderline "educable mentally retarded" range.

The most recently published monograph, Changed Lives, has studied the control and experimental group children through age 19. The children have been followed and studied over the years in terms of three variables: scholastic success, socioeconomic success and social responsibility. There has been minimal attrition of the study's subjects. For example, one of the research instruments, a Young Adult Interview, was administered at age 19 to all but two of the study participants. The median rate of missing

data across all measures has been only five percent.⁴⁶

Extensive data has been collected on the children in both groups. These have included preschool, primary and secondary school records, teacher ratings, parent interviews, police and court records, a youth interview at age 14, records of social services use such as AFDC and general assistance, and a young adult interview at age 19. A further study is planned when the participants are 26.

The following summary of educational and socioeconomic outcomes for those in the experimental group is impressive:⁴⁷

- improved IQ test scores soon after completion of preschool;
- increased academic achievement, by standardized tests, through elementary and middle school;
- higher teacher ratings of social and emotional maturity;
- fewer placements in special education;
- fewer retentions in grade;
- fewer absences;
- a higher value on education and stronger commitment to schooling at age 15;
- fewer failing grades and better marks through high school;
- higher scores on a measure of everyday life skills at age 19;
- higher proportion working at time of age 19 interview (50% vs. 32%);
- fewer months of unemployment since leaving high school;
- higher earnings and a higher proportion self-supporting at age 19 (45% vs. 25%);
- lower incidence of use of certain social services (18% vs. 32%);
- smaller proportion receiving general assistance (19% vs. 41%);
- fewer arrests (31% vs. 51%);
- fewer cases sent to juvenile court;
- fewer months on probation (12 mos. vs. 33 mos.);
- fewer persons fined (3% vs. 14%);
- fewer pregnancies and births (17 vs. 28);
- higher participation in college or vocational training (38% vs. 21%)

Early critics of preschool programs for disadvantaged children have pointed to the "washout" of immediate cognitive or IQ gains by second

grade. The same is true for the Perry Preschool experimental children. However, at age 19 the positive outcomes across several domains are too consistent to be dismissed.

Weikart and Schweinhart make a strong and compelling case for viewing the Perry Preschool Program as the beginning of a more successful chain of life events for those children in the experimental groups.

The children came to a preschool program that had been thoughtfully designed and was carried out by staff who encouraged their active participation. The not-so-surprising result is enhanced cognitive ability, the beginning step in what the authors refer to as the "success flow."⁴⁸

"... greater cognitive ability seems to enhance children's entry into the social system of the school, putting them in a better position than they would otherwise be in, a position which is highly stable and persistent."⁴⁹

In other words, these children had a greater chance of starting school with a leg up, of being welcomed at school entry by teachers because they were more "ready," and of being viewed positively by peers. Most important, probably, these children had more positive self-images, self-concepts and self-esteem as a result of their preschool experience than did their control group peers.

Fortunately or unfortunately, a child's early success or failure in school is likely to abide over time. The early perceptions of a kindergarten teacher can have lasting effects for children. In the first chapter of Young Children Grow Up, Schweinhart and Weikart describe an ethnographic study of life in a kindergarten classroom by R.C. Rist. Among other findings related to the kindergarten's social and socializing process, Rist reports, "The teacher divides children into groups based on his or her evaluation of students at first meeting. In fact, such groupings were made almost irrevocable after only eight days of kindergarten."⁵⁰

If such ability groups and other conscious or unconscious ratings begin so soon after school entrance, it behooves all disadvantaged young children to have had a quality preschool experience to prepare them for success.

The authors describe "school success flow" as having three elements:

commitment to schooling, school achievement and social reinforcement of the student role. Being retained in grade or assigned to special education does not indicate either school achievement or reinforcement of the student role. To the extent that the experimental group children had lower incidences of these two events, their chances for school success were increased.

Success in school is more likely to lead to "life success" than is school failure. The authors describe life success as related to educational attainment, occupational status, income and non-deviant or socially acceptable behavior. The data on the experimental children clearly indicates that their chances for successful lives are significantly greater than those of the children in the control group.

Although the authors do not describe it, readers of these studies can readily visualize a "failure flow" and "life failure" pattern for children who enter school without the advantage of a quality preschool experience. Other than the family, school is the basic success-defining institution in the lives of children.⁵¹ It is more than understandable that early success or failure in this institution can have a profound and lasting effect on a youngster, particularly if he or she is disadvantaged.

Economic Benefits

With Perry Preschool study participants being only 19 at the time of the most recent data collection, it is necessary to make some theoretical assumptions regarding earnings and usage of certain social services.

A set of conservative economic assumptions were used to estimate the increased lifetime earnings for those in the experimental group. This estimate, including fringe benefits, is about \$24,500 - an obvious benefit to the individual. Society is also the beneficiary as about one quarter of these earnings represent new tax revenue.

"The primary economic benefit to society from increased economic independence comes in reduced costs for social service programs."⁵²

The authors also make a theoretical extrapolation of lifetime savings in reduced welfare costs of \$16,415 per person.

Another cost savings is in the criminal justice system. The estimated present value of preschool's total benefit to society as a result of reduced crime is just over \$3,100 per child. This is probably low as victim costs are underestimated and various non-economic factors related to a more crime-free society are not included. Even if all victim costs are not considered, the benefit of reducing costs to the criminal justice system alone is \$2,286 per child.⁵³

The costs of the Perry Preschool Program to the Ypsilanti school system during the early to mid-1960s, computed in 1981 dollars, is \$4,818 per child. Though relatively expensive, it must be remembered that it was a high quality program with adult-child ratios varying from 1:5 to 1:6.25. Also, these figures were not based solely on actual cost. For instance, rent, figured into the calculations, was not actually paid.

Of interest particularly to educational administrators and social welfare policy-makers are the differences in costs for educating the children in the experimental and control groups.

"Putting a child who went to preschool through elementary and secondary school cost the school system, on the average, \$34,813 (in constant 1981 dollars); putting one who did not attend preschool through elementary and secondary school cost, on the average, \$41,895. The difference is \$7,082 per child Since preschool also increased the average educational attainment, this cost difference understates the total increase in educational efficiency."⁵⁴

The overall economic conclusions cannot be ignored.

"Over the lifetimes of the participants, preschool is estimated to yield economic benefits with an estimated present value that is over seven times the cost of one year of the program."⁵⁵

Although the Perry Preschool Program has done the most extensive follow-up research on its subjects and over the longest period of time, other research supports the Ypsilanti findings. The Consortium for Longitudinal Studies has pooled and re-analyzed data from 12 high quality early childhood programs (including Perry Preschool) for disadvantaged preschoolers operated in the 1960's and 1970's.⁵⁶ One important finding related to school expenditures has to do with grade retention and special

education placement.

"At the seventh grade level across eight of the Consortium projects, the average rates of both special education placement and grade retention among former preschool participants was significantly lower than for non-preschool control students who at the outset were judged to be equally or even slightly less at-risk for school failure."⁵⁷

The New York State Experimental Prekindergarten Program began in 1966. A five-year longitudinal study was instituted in 1975 to learn about the effects on children's development. The first set of children to be studied completed third grade in 1980. Those who participated showed strong favorable results on cognitive and non-cognitive measures from the time they entered the school program to the time they entered kindergarten. A greater proportion of these children than those in the control group made normal progress through third grade.

A dramatic finding which has positive implications for Head Start relates to parent involvement. It was found in the New York State study that the more parents were involved in the program, the higher their children tended to score on each of the three measures of cognitive development.

Parents were involved in the New York program in the same ways that parents tend to be involved in Head Start programs throughout the country, including: employment in the program, home visits by staff, volunteering in the classroom, visiting the classroom, educational programs for parents, and participation in decision making about the program.⁵⁸

Such levels of involvement have helped many Head Start parents become strong advocates for the program and their children. Time after time during the past 20 years, parents and other supporters have rallied to see that Head Start federal appropriations were either maintained or increased. As states increasingly enter the funding arena, parents will need to track both national and state activities. Head Start parents, through their long history of monitoring federal activities, should be in a good position to shift some attention to states while continuing to see that no ground is lost on the federal side.

Recently the Committee for Economic Development, an independent research and educational organization made up of business executives and educators, recognized preschool services as a priority. The purpose of this organization is to "propose policies that will help bring about steady economic growth at high employment and reasonably stable prices, increase productivity and living standards, provide greater and more equal opportunity for every citizen and improve the quality of life for all."⁵⁹ In 1985, the Research and Policy Committee of this group of major business leaders issued Investing In Our Children. It draws conclusions from the Ypsilanti project and other research to recommend quality preschool programs for all four year olds from impoverished backgrounds.

"Despite early findings to the contrary, well-designed studies now make it clear that high quality preschool programs lasting one year and targeted to four year olds from poor families can have enormous economic payoffs."⁶⁰



IV. EMERGENT ISSUES

Questions Raised Frequently

Public officials and children's advocates in many states have asked questions about Maine's Head Start appropriation. These questions reflect a growing understanding and a growing frustration about the complexity of the early childhood needs in the United States.

- Should all 3-5 year olds have early childhood services available to them?
- What are our expectations of 3-5 year olds?
- How should such services be administered? By schools? By private agencies? Through coordination mechanisms?
- How can staff of such services be more valued and better paid?
- What is a reasonable unit cost for such services?
- Should young children of low income, minority or single-parent families receive services on a priority basis?
- Should young handicapped, developmentally delayed or at-risk children receive services on a priority basis?
- How should the child care needs of working families be met?
- Can more child care needs be met through use of existing facilities such as Head Start?
- How can local, state and federal funds be utilized for maximum impact?

Head Start as a Model

Philosophically, Head Start is a model for early childhood planners and advocates to explore in depth. It places importance on serving the whole child with an emphasis on nutrition, health and dental care, mental health, cognitive growth and socialization with peers and adults. It has a long history of significant parent involvement. Parent-dominated Policy Councils are instrumental in program management. Nationally, Head Start has a good record for hiring and training parents as staff. It is such components that make for the type of high quality, comprehensive early

childhood programs called for by the Perry Preschool, Consortium for Longitudinal Studies and New York State studies.

Although the amount of Head Start service varies considerably from state to state, Head Start does exist in all states and is recognized nationally. In some states, Head Start has from its inception in 1965 been closely allied with public schools. Elsewhere, the Head Start program became attached to CAPs, along with other War on Poverty programs developed during the Johnson administration.

Whatever its administrative mechanism, Head Start is the only early childhood system with a national presence. Neither day care nor nursery schools are organized on any kind of national basis. John Q. Public is more likely to identify Head Start as "some sort of program for young kids" than any other system. It has become institutionalized in society to the point that the ordinary citizen is not even particularly likely to associate Head Start with low income children.⁶¹

Head Start nationally is not a costly, expensive, cadillac program. Its projected federal cost per child for 1986 was \$2,339,⁶² to which the 20 percent local match should be added in order to gain a more complete picture. Locally, programs are housed in church basements, unused schools, school classrooms and community buildings. Renovations to buildings have usually been done with cost-savings in mind. The early childhood equipment and materials used in Head Start classrooms are sturdy and durable.⁶³

For many reasons, Head Start enjoys broad political support from the left, right and center. It provides services to a population that clearly needs and benefits from those services. Usually, neither administrative nor classroom staff are highly paid. It puts most of its dollars back into local communities through salaries, rental and utility payments and food purchases. It provides a career ladder with some training for many low-income parents or community members. In those communities where Head Start centers exist, they have become firmly established over time and are a part of the social service picture.⁶⁴

The low cost of Head Start is largely due to low salaries. These are "an average of \$7,700 compared to the average starting public school

salary of \$14,500 and the average overall pay of \$23,546. Three quarters of Head Start staff count on unemployment insurance during the summer to flesh out their incomes, a practice questioned in 1985 . . . and likely to be stopped.⁶⁵ One result is high staff turnover with about 20 percent leaving after less than a year.⁶⁶

Despite the gloomy salary picture, experts urge Head Start expansion. Former U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe, in a report entitled Barriers To Excellence: Our Children at Risk, recommends expansion of Head Start to enroll all eligible children.⁶⁷

Unfortunately, Head Start has not become visible in every community where it is needed. Nationally, it is now serving only 18 percent⁶⁸ of those eligible as increasing numbers of young children are moving into poverty. In Maine, even with the recent state expansion, approximately 75 percent of the Head Start eligible children are not being served.

How Should Early Childhood Programs Be Delivered?

As indicated in Section II, several states are currently considering how to increase services to children under the age of five, particularly the disadvantaged, at-risk or non-English speaking. Some, such as South Carolina, have passed legislation and appropriated funds to begin serving four year olds through public school programs.

Many early childhood advocates worry that if state funds are administered through the public schools, there is a danger of kindergarten and first grade expectations being applied to three and four year olds. They also have concerns about maintaining good adult-child ratios and retaining the full complement of comprehensive services including significant parent involvement. On the other hand, salaries paid by school systems are higher and more likely to attract and retain qualified personnel.

As state government policy-makers, legislators and early childhood advocates work toward increased services for young children, what questions should they keep in mind? Here are at least a few:

- Should one institution, such as public education, be in charge?
- Can a pluralistic system, involving several entities such as

- Head Start, child care and schools, be developed?
- How can such a system be managed and work in the best interests of families with varying needs?

It is clear from the research that young, disadvantaged children need high quality, comprehensive services such as those provided by Head Start. They need the social, health and nutrition services that are a part of Head Start as well as the emphasis that is placed on their parents being involved. This will be a more expensive program than one that concentrates primarily on cognitive skills.

Child Care*

By now child care is no longer seen as a feminist frill. Politicians from both sides of the aisle acknowledge it as part of the spectrum of services needed by today's families. Many states have issued reports in recent years defining and describing their needs for child care and outlining ways to increase its availability. Partnerships with businesses and placing child care centers in high schools have been suggested.

Four states (Connecticut, Kentucky, Minnesota and Rhode Island) are receiving technical assistance from the National Conference of State Legislatures through a Carnegie Corporation grant to help states develop child care and early childhood education policy. Although these states will be working on a wide range of issues, certain specifics, such as expanding tax credits for employers, are related to child care.⁶⁹

Across the country many Head Start agencies also provide child care. This is true in Maine where nine of the 13 Head Start agencies provided child care services to 733 children during the 1985-86 year. Some attend Head Start during part of the day and stay on for child care because their parents are working or in training. Others require full-time protective care.

Can Head Start and child care, both part of the needed early childhood service spectrum, grow and develop mutually? For increasing numbers of American families, full-day, full-year services are needed. If a family is

*Note to the Reader: The term child care has been used instead of day care to express the author's belief that it is children, not days, who need care.

eligible, can a system be developed which would allow a child to be placed in Head Start for half the day and stay in the same facility for another half-day of quality child care?

There are many Head Start facilities with equipment and supplies that are only used half-days and are vacant during the summer months. Head Start has a pool of trained personnel who are knowledgeable about young children. Many Head Start staff would be interested in working more hours per week or an extended year if adequate funds were available. Surely creative co-mingling of funds and resources from Head Start, child care and other sources can resolve some of the child care problems of eligible families.

Salaries and Credentials

The two issues of staff salaries and staff certification, licensure or credentialing are probably the ones which will cause the most trouble as states move forward in developing their early childhood systems.

The academic or experience requirements to work with young children vary widely from state to state. Even within states, requirements may vary depending on whether the administering agency is the public school, Head Start, a private nursery school or a child care program. Some public school systems require early childhood certification while others accept elementary certification.

Head Start is deservedly proud of its record for hiring parents. Increasingly, as these staff earn degrees they are hired away by school systems at better salaries. Even without degrees, or with CDA (Child Development Associate) certification, they are often hired away as teacher aides. This is beneficial for the employees and for the schools but is difficult for Head Start programs in many states where staff recruitment and retention are increasingly difficult.

The Early Childhood Education Commission in New York City in its report, Take a Giant Step, makes an important recommendation which addresses these issues of credentials and salaries.⁷⁰ It is particularly interesting because the overall approach recommended by this Commission is one that utilizes the existing Head Start, child care and public school systems. Thus its recommendation that "a comprehensive strategy should

be developed for recruiting, training and retaining a pool of qualified staff . . .⁷¹ is one that would apply to those states wanting to maximize their present early childhood systems.

Services To Handicapped Children

The federal requirement that at least 10 percent of Head Start's children must be handicapped has created a significant service for these children and their families. During the first few years following adoption of this regulation, there were concerns that only minimally or moderately handicapped children were being accepted by Head Start.

However, with time and experience many Head Start centers have enrolled more severely handicapped children. Nationally, Head Start is the place where mainstreamed services begin for many young handicapped children. Although the families and advocates of these children always seek increased resources and trained personnel within Head Start for this population, it is, nevertheless, the only national early childhood program with such a mandate. Many Head Start agencies serve well over 10 percent.

In Maine, an interdepartmental coordination system is in place for 3-5 year old handicapped children. It is organized through 16 local coordination programs across the state. In many localities, the Head Start center is where a placement can be arranged so a handicapped child can be with peers. Needed services, such as speech, physical or occupational therapy can be provided there, giving Head Start staff an opportunity to learn from such specialists.

The efficacy of early services for handicapped children has been well established in recent years. As states develop funding and programs for preschool children, it would be useful to study Head Start's precedent for serving the handicapped. If such a requirement can be incorporated as state legislation and regulations are written, it will enhance the development of a comprehensive service system.

Interagency Coordination

It will be important during the next several years, as the nation's early childhood system evolves, for advocates to continually insist on

developmentally appropriate services which meet the needs of the whole child. The Head Start model, with its focus on health, mental health, dental, nutritional, social service, parent involvement and cognitive domains, continues to provide a solid comprehensive structure.

In at least a few states (Florida, Massachusetts, South Carolina), interagency councils or committees are being established as legislation for early services is passed. Such councils have the potential for bringing together the relevant departments of state government, private organizations and advocates. Such councils can work out turf issues and ensure that age-appropriate and comprehensive services are provided with state funds. They can be the place for important questions - such as how much focus on cognitive development or what emphasis on parent involvement - to be debated.

The demand for full-day, full-year high quality child care is increasingly insistent. Half-day programs or even public school programs which follow the school schedule are not solutions for most working families. State-level interagency councils, comprised of educational, medical, mental health, social service and parent representatives could be the forums for debating how to meet this need. They could also be the groups to recommend state-level early childhood policy on other complex issues such as credentials, salaries and program standards.

While states are making gains in establishing early childhood policies, services and funding, the role of the federal government should not be diminished. Head Start and Title XX child care are probably the best examples of federally-supported early childhood programs. While neither are adequately funded, they nevertheless provide a basis in both statute and funding that has common elements across the country. They should not be allowed to diminish as states enter the picture. Active interagency councils could also be helpful in this area, as states determine how to maximize, with additional state revenues, the federal early childhood resources already coming to them.



V. SUMMARY

Maine provides a unique example for other states to examine. It has increased by one-third the number of children receiving Head Start services. It has equalized these services across the county geographic boundaries and established a uniform unit cost for the state funds.

Many states are moving to increase their services to prekindergarten children, particularly those who are considered to be at-risk or disadvantaged. Head Start was originally designed for this population and a substantial body of research indicates that a comprehensive program such as Head Start is what is needed to begin a successful chain of life events for children who participate.

States increasingly have and should take the opportunity to expand upon the Head Start model. They need to consider up-grading existing services, particularly by raising staff salaries and expanding such services to more children.

"Certainly, key decisions, particularly about the national Head Start program, will continue to be made in Washington, D.C. We anticipate that other key decisions will be forthcoming in the next decade from state governments. In fact, state governments have the most to gain from the establishment of these programs, for it is state governments that now bear the vast costs of education (particularly for children from low-income families), of the legal system, and of the welfare system. Their initial financial outlays for provision of high quality early childhood programs for children from low-income families will, in the long run, result in savings in state budgets." 72



REFERENCES

1. Memo from Division of Community Services to the Department of Human Services, Division of Child Care, Licensing, November 19, 1984. (See Appendix 1.)
2. From structured interviews conducted with the 13 Maine Head Start Directors, February-June, 1986.
3. Ibid.
4. Final Enrollment Allocation, Division of Community Services, November, 1984. (See Column 8 of Appendix 2).
5. Structured interviews, op. cit.
6. Structured interviews, op. cit.
7. Structured interviews, op. cit.
8. Structured interviews, op. cit.
9. Structured interviews, op. cit.
10. Education: Maine's Most Important Investment, Report of the Commission on the Status of Education in Maine, Maine State Planning Office, June, 1984.
11. Interview with Elizabeth "Libby" Mitchell, former Majority Leader, Maine House of Representatives, 111th Maine Legislature and Vice-Chairman, Commission on the Status of Education in Maine, March, 1986.
12. Correspondence from Barbara Mauro, Alaska Department of Community and Regional Affairs, February, 1986.
13. "Child Development Division Program Facts, Volume 1," Child Development Division, California State Department of Education, February, 1985, and correspondence from California Senator David Roberti, March, 1986.
14. Phone conversation with Brian McNulty, Director of Special Education Services, Colorado Department of Education, August, 1986.
15. "Prekindergarten Programs for Four-Year-Olds: State Education Agency Initiatives," Carolyn Morado, October, 1985, p. 1.
16. Ibid., p. 20.
17. Ibid., p. 16.
18. Phone conversation with Ellen Hoffenberg, Governor's Constituency for Children, Tallahassee, Florida, July, 1986.
19. Phone conversation with Chaimer Moore, Illinois Department of Education, July, 1986.
20. Phone conversation with Mary Culkin, National Conference of State Legislatures, July, 1986.
21. Morado, op. cit., p. 16.
22. Ibid., p. 17.
23. Correspondence with Montgomery County Government, May, 1986.

24. Phone conversation with Carole Thomson, Massachusetts Department of Education, July, 1986.
25. Phone conversation with Kerry Allen, Head Start Director, Springfield, Massachusetts, July, 1986.
26. Morado, op. cit., p. 17.
27. Phone conversation with Carolyn Morado, July, 1986.
28. Phone conversation with Carolyn Logan, Michigan Department of Education, July, 1986.
29. Correspondence with Rep. Sally Olsen, Minnesota House of Representatives, April, 1986.
30. "Schooling: When Should It Begin?," Christian Science Monitor supplement, March 28, 1986.
31. Morado, op. cit., p. 18.
32. Action Plan for Children, Governor's Committee on Children's Services Planning, 1985, pp. 100-106.
33. Morado, op. cit., p. 18.
34. Take a Giant Step: An Equal Start in Education for All New York City Four-Year-Olds, Early Childhood Education Commission, New York City, March, 1986.
35. "City Will Begin To Offer Classes for 4-Year-Olds," New York Times, July 24, 1986, and phone conversation with Suzanne Carothers, Office of the Mayor, August, 1986.
36. Morado, op. cit., p. 18.
37. Ibid., p. 19.
38. Phone conversation with Judy Doebler, Oklahoma Department of Education, June, 1986.
39. Morado, op. cit., p. 19.
40. Phone conversation with Linda Dickenson, Director, C.H.I.L.D., Inc., Warwick, Rhode Island, July, 1986.
41. South Carolina Education Improvement Act of 1984, Early Childhood Education and Interagency Cooperation, provided by the Children's Defense Fund.
42. "Early Childhood Development Programs in the Eighties: The National Picture," High Scope Early Childhood Policy Paper #1, Lawrence J. Schweinhart and David P. Weickart, Editors, High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, Ypsilanti, Michigan, p. 35.
43. Phone conversation with Alicia Castro, Texas Education Agency, July, 1986.
44. Phone conversation with Grey Ritchie, Kindergarten Supervisor, Virginia Department of Education, August, 1986.
45. Phone conversation with Jeanne Darneille, Program Manager, Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program, Washington State Department of Community Development, May, 1986.
46. Changed Lives: The Effects of the Perry Preschool Program on Youths Through Age 19, Clement, Schweinhart, Barnett, Epstein and Weikart, High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, Ypsilanti, Michigan, 1984, p. 9.
47. Ibid., pp. 43-58, 61-75, 77-92.

48. Young Children Grow Up: The Effects of the Perry Preschool Program on Youths Through Age 15, L. J. Schweinhart and D. P. Weikart, High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, Ypsilanti, Michigan, 1980, p. 11.
49. Ibid.
50. Ibid., p. 10.
51. Ibid., p. 11.
52. Changed Lives, op. cit., p. 56.
53. Ibid., pp. 73-75.
54. Ibid., p. 37.
55. Ibid., p. 1.
56. As the Twig Is Bent... Lasting Effects of Preschool Programs, Consortium for Longitudinal Studies, Richard Darlington, 1983.
57. Take a Giant Step, op. cit., p. 58.
58. "Evaluation of the New York State Experimental Prekindergarten Program, Final Report," State Department of Education, Albany, New York, February, 1982.
59. Investing in Our Children, Committee for Economic Development, New York, 1985, p. viii.
60. Ibid., p. 43.
61. "The Charmed Life of Head Start," Peter Skerry, The Public Interest, No. 73, Fall, 1983, pp. 18-39.
62. Project Head Start Statistical Fact Sheet, Administration for Children, Youth and Families, December, 1985.
63. Skerry, op. cit.
64. Ibid.
65. A Look at 1985, Early Childhood Education, The Year in Review, James L. Hymes, Jr. Hacienda Press, Carmel, California, 1986, p. 1.
66. Ibid., p. 2.
67. Ibid.
68. Ibid., p. 1.
69. Phone Conversation with Mary Culkin, op. cit.
70. Take a Giant Step, op. cit., pp. 35-38.
71. Ibid., p. 35.
72. Changed Lives, op. cit., p. 114.



APPENDICES



Appendix 1

STATE OF MAINE
Inter-Departmental Memorandum

To Mildred Hart

From Janet W. Peters, Asst. to the Director

Subject New Head Start Classrooms

Date November 19, 1984

Dept. Div. of Child Care Licensing

Dept. Division of Community Services

As I told you last week, this office has received state funding for 665 additional slots in the Head Start Program. It is our hope that the new classrooms will be operational as soon as possible.

I've talked to the Head Start Directors and the following lists the type of facilities that will need licensing:

<u>Agency</u>	<u>New Classrooms</u>	<u>Classrooms added to Facility</u>
Action Opportunities	4	
Androscoggin Child Develop.	2	1
Aroostook County Action Program	3	
Coastal Economic Development	3	
Kennebec ValleyCommunity Action	4	1
Mid-Coast Human Resource Council	1	
Oxford County Community Services	1	1
People's Regional Opportunity Prog.	4	2
Penquis Community Action Program	2	
So. Kennebec Child Development Corp.	2	
Waldo County Committee for Social Action	1 facility (2 classrooms)	
York County Community Action Prog.	2	
 Total	 30	 5

If our office can be of further assistance, please contact me.

JWP/bds

State of Maine: Head Start Program FY '85: Final Enrollment Allocation

1 County/Agency	2 No. of Children	3 FY '85 ACYF Enrollment Allotment	4 Percent Served	5 Federal \$ FY '85	6 Local Match	7 Total
Androscoggin Co. H.S.	761	167	21.9	\$330,703.00	\$82,675.75	\$413,378.75
Aroostook Co. ACAP	775	177	22.8	472,716.76	118,179.19	590,895.95
Cumberland Co. PROP CED	1,265 156 25	181 156 25	14.3	448,254.00 52,792.00	112,063.50 13,198.00	560,317.50 65,990.00
Franklin Co. CAP	180	65	36.1	160,076.00	40,019.00	200,095.00
Hancock Co. AOI	308	60	19.5	147,846.50	36,911.63	184,558.13
Kennebec Co. KVCAP So. Child Devel.	743 45 120	165 45 120	22.2	120,376.50 311,908.00	30,094.13 77,977.00	150,470.63 389,885.00
Knox Co. MCHRC	228	60	26.3	159,508.00	39,877.00	199,385.00
Lincoln Co. CED	224	80	35.7	168,935.00	42,233.80	211,168.80
Oxford Co. Comm. Serv.	406	76	18.7	178,948.00	44,737.00	223,685.00
Penobscot Co. Penquis CAP	975	187	19.2	425,541.50	106,385.70	513,927.20
Piscataquis Co. Penquis CAP	136	69	50.7	157,018.50	39,354.60	196,273.10
Sagadahoc Co. CED	213	20	9.4	42,234.00	10,558.50	52,792.50
Somerset Co. KVVCAP	555	79	14.2	144,451.50	36,112.95	180,564.45
Waldo Co. WCCSA	362	60	16.6	169,447.00	42,361.75	211,808.75
Washington Co. Action Opp. Inc. ACAP	502 60 17	77 60 17	15.3	147,846.50 45,402.24	36,911.63 11,350.56	184,558.13 56,752.80
York Co. YCCAC	643	146	22.7	374,708.00	93,677.00	468,385.00

State 8,276 1,869 20.2 4,058,313.00 1,014,578.69 5,072,891.69

* Combined total of the county.

Appendix 2

8 Cost per Child (Federal)	9 No. of Slots Needed to Reach 20%	10 Cost @ \$2,500/ Child	11 % of Total Eligible	12 Additional Allocation Slots	13 Additional Allocation Cost	14 Total Enrollment Allocation	15 Total State Funding By County
\$1,980.26			9.20	44	\$110,000.	44	\$110,000.
2,670.71			9.36	44	110,000.	44	110,000.
2,873.42	72*	180,000.	15.29	72*	180,000.	144*	360,000.
2,111.69	60	150,000.		60	150,000.	120	300,000.
2,111.69	12	30,000.		12	30,000.	24	60,000.
2,482.71			2.17	10	25,000.	10	25,000.
2,400.78	2	5,000.	3.72	18	45,000.	20	50,000.
2,135.71			8.98	43*	107,500.	43*	107,500.
2,599.23				17	42,500.	17	42,500.
				26	65,000.	26	65,000.
2,858.47			2.75	13	32,500.	13	32,500.
2,111.69			2.71	13	32,500	13	32,500.
2,354.58	6	15,000.	4.91	23	57,500.	29	72,500.
2,275.63	8	20,000.	11.78	56	140,000.	64	160,000.
2,275.63			1.64	8	20,000.	8	20,000.
2,111.69	23	57,500.	2.57	12	30,000.	35	87,500.
2,135.71	32	80,000.	6.71	32	80,000.	64	160,000
2,824.12	13	32,500.	4.37	21	52,500.	34	85,000
2,480.78	34*	85,000.	6.07	29*	72,500.	63*	157,500.
	33	82,500.		28	70,000.	61	152,500.
	1	2,500.		1	2,500.	2	5,000.
2,566.49			7.77	37	92,500.	37	92,500.
2,431.58	190	475,000.	100.00	475	1,187,500.	665	1,662,500.

Prepared by DCS: 11/15/84

**STATE OF MAINE
HEAD START PROGRAMS & DIRECTORS**

Grant R. Lee
ACTION OPPORTUNITIES, INC.*
Box 562
Ellsworth, ME 04605
Tel: (207) 667-2995

Deborah Damon
OXFORD CAP HEAD START
P. O. Box 278
South Paris, ME 04281
Tel: (207) 743-7716

Ann Ward
ANDROSCOGGIN COUNTY HEAD START*
Coburn School
Bates Street
Lewiston, ME 04240
Tel: (207) 784-7347

Kenneth D. Cole
PENQUIS HEAD START
P. O. Box 1162
Bangor, ME 04401
Tel: (207) 947-6931, Ext. 44

Belinda Carter
AROOSTOCK COUNTY HEAD START
P. O. Box 1116
Presque Isle, ME 04769
Tel: (207) 764-3721

Mark Conrad
PROP HEAD START
P. O. Box 2351
So. Portland, ME 04106
Tel: (207) 799-5221

Patricia Finn
COASTAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORP.
Head Start
800 High Street
Bath, ME 04530
Tel: (207) 442-7963

Elizabeth J. Ayotte
SO. KENNEBEC VALLEY CHILD DEV.*
Corner/Oxford & Franklin Streets
Augusta, ME 04330
Tel: (207) 623-2501

Gail Oulette
FRANKLIN COUNTY HEAD START
P. O. Box 200
East Wilton, ME 04234
Tel: (207) 645-4931

Harriet Morrow
WALDO COUNTY HEAD START
Route 1, Box 2000
Freedom, ME 04941
Tel: (207) 338-3827

Jan Covell
KENNEBEC VALLEY CAP HEAD START
P. O. Box 278
Waterville, ME 04901
Tel: (207) 873-2122

Lois Jones and Mabel Desmaris
YORK COUNTY HEAD START
P. O. Box U
Biddeford, ME 04005
Tel: (207) 282-6290

Christine Maxcy
MID-COAST HUMAN RESOURCE COUNCIL
Head Start
P. O. Box 808
Rockland, ME 04841
Tel: (207) 596-0361

* Single purpose agencies

RECOMMENDATION #5 FROM
EDUCATION: MAINE'S MOST IMPORTANT INVESTMENT

5. We recommend that DECS and local school systems place a high priority on better preparing children during their earliest years of schooling.

In particular, we recommend that:

- DECS develop a standard screening and assessment program that will allow schools to place pupils in grades K-3 according to their readiness;
- the Early Childhood Education Plans program be expanded, at an annual cost of \$250,000, to accommodate the interest already expressed by school officials in developing K-3 readiness programs; and
- the federally-funded Head Start program be expanded, with State appropriations at an annual cost of \$2.1 million, to serve at least 20 percent of Maine's eligible children.

* In 1982, Head Start programs were available to an average of 12-15% of the eligible students across Maine, compared to a 20% average nationwide. In Washington and Hancock counties, Head Start is available to only 7 percent of those eligible. Source: Maine Division of Community Services.

TITLE 5
REVISED STATUTES ANNOTATED
CHAPTER 330

MAINE COMMUNITY SERVICES ACT

§3514. Division of Community Services

There is established, to carry out the purposes of this chapter, the Division of Community Services in the Executive Department, which shall carry out the responsibilities of State Government relating to planning and financing community services and community action agencies and shall administer state and federal community services' programs and other block grants that may be available, including, but not limited to, energy assistance, weatherization, food assistance and Head Start.

§3518. Division of Community Services; powers and duties

1. Federal, state and other funds. Through plans and contracts developed with advice from the board, the division shall obtain, distribute and administer federal, state and other community services' funds, including block grants, energy assistance, weatherization, food assistance, Head Start and other funds as may become available. Any balances of funds appropriated to the Division of Community Services remaining at the end of a fiscal year shall not lapse, but shall be carried forward from year to year to be expanded for the same purpose.

Besides those towns noted on the cover illustration, the following Maine communities also opened new Head Start centers as a result of expansion: Biddeford, Calais, Carmel, East Machias, Fairfield, Fort Fairfield, Gardiner, Mechanic Falls, Medway, North Berwick, Oxford, Rockland, Rumford, Searsport, Skowhegan, Sullivan and Winterville. Additional classrooms were opened in several of Maine's larger towns and cities which had existing centers.

This report was produced and distributed by Action Opportunities, Inc. of Ellsworth, Maine, pursuant to grant #C1CH000229 from the Administration for Children, Youth and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The contents do not necessarily represent the policy of that agency and no endorsement by the federal government should be assumed.